Illinois Report Card Project

Meeting: Advisory Committee Meeting
Date: May 13, 2011
Participants: Amy Alsop (IFT), Amy Nowell (CPS), Ben Boer (Advance Illinois), Colleen Donovan (BCG), Conor Reilley (Student Advisory Council), Dan Brown (ISBE), Diane Rutledge (LUDA), Elaine Johnson (ICCB), Erika Hunt (IL-SEALP), Harvey Smith (IIRC), Jennifer Nadeo (Schaumburg CCSD #54), Jessica Handy (Stand for Children), Peggy Mueller (UWMC), Larry Fillingim (ROE20), Larry Frank (IEA/NEA), Marin Gjaja (BCG), Max McGee (IMSA/P20 Council), Melissa Mitchell (Fed. Of Community Schools), Michelle Russell (BCG), Myles Gearon (Student Advisory Council), Rich Voltz (IASA), Sean German (IPA), Sharod Gordon (TARGET), Steve Cordogan (District 214 Township HS), Robin Steans (AI/P20 Council), Steve Pearson (Advance Illinois), Sue Walter (IFT)

Topics of discussion: progress and P-20 council meeting update; preliminary focus group research plan; v0.2 report card design assumptions and metrics;

Summary of discussion:
- Advisory Committee reviewed progress and key themes from P-20 council meeting presentation
  - Team midway through development phase (to be followed by 'Refinement & Validation' July – August and 'Legislation Preparation' September – October)
  - One-on-one discussions have taken place with Steering Committee members, Advisory Committee members, and additional education experts
  - Benchmarking conducted to compare metrics in report card v0.1 and v0.2 to state and city report card benchmarks
  - At P-20 Council meeting in late April, Robin Steans, Max McGee and BCG team introduced report card project, including view on report cards, pyramid logic, project deliverables, guiding questions, approach and workplan
    - Council emphasized importance of stakeholder engagement to success
    - Team clarified that at current stage, scope of report cards is K-12
- Briefly reviewed focus group research plan
  - Key stakeholders to include in focus groups: parents, students, teachers, principals, district or state administration, broader community key constituents
    - Suggestion to include individuals involved with college & career readiness
    - Confirmed Larry Frank and Sue Walter will leverage their professional organizations to coordinate scheduling with teachers (IEANEA and IFT)
  - Group structure: ideal group sizes 5-8, maximum of 10-12
  - Selection criteria: goal to capture representative sample of districts; recommendation to approach based on locale, but also potential to include socio-economic factors; must ensure speaking with parents beyond those who are highly engaged
  - Sequence/ timing: scheduled from mid July (primarily principals, teachers, administrators) to end August (parents)
  - Coordination and implementation: focus groups to be led by members of Steering/ Advisory Committees or other relevant community leaders; P-20 council committee, 'Family, Youth, and Community Engagement,' along with additional members will lead team to coordinate focus groups
    - Focus group lead team will be meeting soon to coordinate focus group plans; will send update to Advisory Committee after meeting if necessary

- Report card design assumptions discussed and agreed to

- o Four separate report cards to be designed to address majority of schools, recognizing additional report cards will be needed for various grade-level configurations. v0.2 report cards include:
  - High school (grades 9-12)
  - Late elementary (grades 6-8)
  - Primary elementary (PK/K-5)
  - District
  - Note: For K-8 schools, will combine primary and late elementary cards
- o One-pager will ideally have 10-15 metrics with a cover page for additional context characteristics
- o One-pager will only communicate metrics at the 'overall school' level
  - Detailed report can include metric breakdowns by demographic groups, socioeconomic levels, grades, etc
- o District report card will not simply be a roll-up of schools' metrics; will also include metrics relevant for district (e.g. management metrics)
  - District card to be developed once initial alignment reached on school
- Aligned that current focus is on metrics and respective thresholds
  - o Have gained general alignment in past meetings on the guiding question and sub-categories related to each guiding question
  - o In future meetings, will address calculation rubrics and visual display (e.g. single data pt or chart, comparisons to peers and/or district/state averages)
- Advisory Committee discussed report card guiding questions and sub-categories and, in some cases, suggested changes
  - o Outcomes: Are students achieving quality outcomes?
    - *Sub-categories:* Graduation/ promotion to next level**;** Readiness for next level**;** Success in the next level
  - o Progress: Are students making progress toward quality outcomes?
    - *Sub-categories:* On track**;** Performance; Gains
      - Question as to whether 'Performance' (Are students meeting state standards? Are students exceeding state standards?) belongs under 'Outcomes' instead, reasoning it is a "time-specific outcome"
      - Suggestion to name 3rd sub-category 'Growth' instead of 'Gains'
  - o Environment: Is the school/ district environment conducive to enabling quality outcomes and progress?
    - *Sub-categories:* Presence & engagement; Safety; Professional Climate; Instructional Quality
    - Suggestion to report on 'Instructional quality' first within 'Environment'
    - Desire to find new word for 'enabling' in guiding question
    - Some interest in expanding on 'Environment' guiding question to also include view of resources (e.g. space utilization, age of textbooks, library quality and access, access to technology)
      - Agreed this may be more appropriate on front page among other school characteristics
    - Agreed to not spend significant time during meeting on this guiding question given team separately working with Consortium to understand how survey instrument could be reported in context of report card; will provide update to Committee at next meeting
      - E.g., Could instead name 'Safety' sub-category 'Learning Climate' and 'Instructional Quality' sub-category 'Academic Press' to encompass instructional quality, coherence of curriculum, academic expectations

- Reminded Committee that goal is to include highest value metrics for "one pager"
  - V0.2 is current view of highest value metrics; additional metrics in "lifeboat" will be reconsidered in focus groups
- Advisory Committee reviewed report card v0.2 for all school levels
  - Reviewed each metric separately by discussing decisions regarding 1) what to measure, 2) how to measure, and 3) threshold – included both current guidance and other metrics/ thresholds considered
  - Outcomes
    - Graduation (HS) – '% of students graduating within 4 yrs'
      - Agreement that we will use nationally agreed upon calculation
    - Readiness (HS) – '% of students meeting composite ACT college & career readiness threshold of 20'
      - Recognition that ACT does not have composite threshold so will be up to IL to select one – would likely be either 20 or 21
      - Some interest in reporting ACT performance by subject given colleges base decisions off of subject scores, not composite
        - However, concern that this will be confusing for parents and goal is to keep report card simple
        - Will test in focus groups to understand what parents prefer
      - Agreement report card should be aligned with HS to College Success Report – will meet with Elaine Johnson to learn which metrics will be included
      - Acknowledged 'Career readiness assessment' as a "lifeboat" metric for the HS report card – will continue to test in one-on-one discussions and in focus groups to determine if warrants position on one-pager
        - May need to include if state pushing for greater use of WorkKeys assessment
        - Concern raised that students do not take assessment seriously; response that placing it on report card could serve to heighten the assessment's relevance
      - Next steps include analyzing what % of students score $\geq$ 20 and 21 on ACT
    - Success (HS) – '% of graduates who enrolled in post-secondary institution and maintained 'Satisfactory Academic Progress' after 2 semesters'
      - Data expected to be included in HS to College Success Report, but concern about coverage
        - HS to College Success Report will only include first-year, full-time students at public IL institutions; excluding private and out-of-state institutions could give distorted view of performance
          - Will follow-up with Andy Davis re: coverage
      - Suggestion to include 2 metrics: 1) % enrolling in post-secondary and 2) 'under construction' metric for graduates graduating from post-secondary institution
      - Also need to consider how different institution types will be treated in metric (e.g. non-selective and unaccredited schools)
      - Team will investigate metrics being tracked by 'Complete College America' for other options
    - Promotion (Late elem) – '% of students promoted to next school on time'
      - Committee believes this number will be very high for all schools and therefore will not tell us anything

- If denominator is 6th graders three years ago, could incent promotion even when retention may be a better option
- Team will analyze rate; if uniformly high, will remove
- Readiness (Late elem) – '% of 8th graders passing Algebra I with grade of C or better'
    - Concern about grade inflation and credibility of Algebra class across all schools
        - In response to this, CPS instituted an Algebra I exit exam
        - If concern about inflation continues, can use enrollment
    - Also concern about whether this will unfairly damage schools that don't offer Algebra I
        - Other Committee members argued this would raise awareness about importance of Algebra I, push policy
        - Team will investigate what % of schools offer Algebra I
    - Suggestion to include 8th grade ISAT performance on math & reading – team will include this in v0.3
- Success (Late elem) – '% of most recent alumni Freshman on track'
    - Agreement that this is an important metric; also helpful to align with High school report card
- Promotion (Primary elem) – '% of students promoted to next school on time'
    - *See above - Same concerns/ next steps as Late elementary*
- Readiness (Primary elem) – '% of 3rd graders meeting/ exceeding and % exceeding Reading ISAT state standards'
    - General alignment that 3rd grade is an important transition to highlight – moving from 'learning to read' to 'reading to learn'
    - Questioned why not focusing on grade immediately before Late elementary (5th grade) – some anticipate highly correlated with 3rd grade; research suggests 3rd grade success is essential
    - Suggestion to also include Math performance
        - Team will investigate this further, possibly include in v0.3
- Success (Primary elem) – '% of most recent alumni meeting/exceeding and % exceeding ISAT state standards'
    - Some questioned whether state test performance is the 'best' way to assess success and suggested other potential options:
        - % alumni enrolling in Algebra I – concern that Primary elementary schools have no control over Algebra I access
        - % alumni promoted from 8th grade (goal being to look at % who drop-out) – concern this could incent promotion when retention may be better option; also some concern that this is too far removed from when students leave primary elementary ("a lot can happen between 6th and 8th grade that is not the fault of the primary elementary school")
    - Team will analyze rates for recommended and suggested metrics
- Progress
    - On track (HS) –'% of Freshman on track'
        - Agreement that this is an important metric
        - Team will contact Chris Mazzeo to learn about statewide analysis of on-track metric
    - Performance (HS, Late/Primary elementary) – '% of students meeting/exceeding and % exceeding PSAE [or ISAT] state standards'

- Agreement that this is 'best' option with current assessments
- Committee comfortable including advanced courses (courses offered, participation) on front page with school characteristics
  - Especially relevant if state pushing more advanced courses
  - Also opportunity to raise awareness with parents; encourage them to use report card as tool to push policy if school does not currently offer AP classes
  - Growth [formerly Gains] (HS, Late/Primary elementary) – will appear as 'under construction' until fully implemented
    - Agreement that this is an important metric to include
  - On track (Late elementary) – '% of 6th graders meeting/exceeding and % exceeding ISAT state standards'
    - Agreement that this is our 'best' option with current assessments and lack of standard curriculum/ requirements in Late elementary (which prohibits using HS on track metric)
  - On track (Primary elementary) – '% of students entering Kindergarten who have experienced pre-school'
    - Concern about whether state tracks private preschool participation
    - Team will investigate data available at ISBE and via the IECAM (IL Early Childhood Asset Map)
    - In long-term, will use Kindergarten Readiness Assessment metric
  - Environment – given time constraints and fact that climate survey selected will impact several subcategories, only discussed on attendance measure within 'Presence & Engagement' sub-category
    - Student and teacher attendance – '% with fewer than 10 absences'
      - Agreement that student attendance should be included
      - Concern that teacher attendance will unfairly impact teachers given they have: professional development days; days not spent in classroom, but administering tests; right to sick days
        - Others argued we should focus on student/ parent perspective – only matters whether teacher in classroom
      - Suggestion to consider instead reporting '% with more than 10 absences' given absences are inherently negative
        - Team will test both options in focus groups
        - Need to consider impact of switching between a high number being a positive vs. a negative indicator
      - Team will analyze teacher attendance data to understand prevalence of various absence codes; will recommend how to approach calculation
    - Recommendation to also include dropout rate within this guiding question – push-out is a big issue, especially for minority students

Next steps
- **BCG team to incorporate Advisory Committee input into report card v0.3 for discussion at Steering Committee meeting on Wednesday, June 1**
- **BCG team to develop district report card, prelim. display of school report cards**
- **BCG team to meet with Focus Group lead team to coordinate focus group planning**